UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Youth Movement

By SYDNEY STRONG

War Profit and Peace

By BENJAMIN P. HORTON

Non-Resistance in the Ruhr

By J. HENRY SCATTERGOOD

VOLUME XCII NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 13, 1923

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Curtis W. Reese
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Jottings.—J. H. H. 6
Editorial Correspondence—
The Youth Movement.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 6

ARTICLES—
War Profit and Peace.—BENJAMIN P. HORTON 8
Non-Resistance in the Ruhr.—*J. Henry Scattergood* 11
Parliamentary Control of Foreign Affairs.—H. S. N. 12
The Civilization of Asia.—J. T. SUNDERLAND.. 13

POETRY—
Moods in the Museum—Before a Chinese Shrine.—LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF 3

THE STUDY TABLE—
Reviews:
The Enchanted April, by "Elizabeth."—HARRIET T. COMSTOCK 14
Atmagnan, or Life in the Spirit, by T. L. Vaswani—The Christian Campaign for a Warless World, by Sidney L. Gulick—Autobiography of Countess Tolstoy, translation by S. S. Koteliansky and Leonard Woolf.—B. F. M. 14

THE FIELD—
Manifesto of London Peace Society 15
Prof. Starr Safe in Japan.—*Chicago Tribune*.. 15
Mr. Sastri and Opium 15

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. XCII. THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1923 NUMBER 1

MOODS IN THE MUSEUM.

Before a Chinese Shrine.

The little bells ring lightly as the jewelled lanterns swing,
Throned Buddha broods politely 'neath a gilded pheasant's wing;
Coiled dragons sprawl in splendor steeped in heavy-lidded calm
Where the god upon a lotus wields a mild oppressive charm.

Stately twilight overtakes me as I drowse before the god,
Western Idols are abandoned under bland Gautama's nod;
Drenching timelessness enshrouds me with a sense of suave release
As I yield in wise surrender to the Oriental's peace!

LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF.

This editorial is written and placed in the mail at just the moment (September 3rd) when the vast issue of the Graeco-Italian crisis in its relation to the League of Nations, is hanging in the balance. We call this a vast issue, for we believe that it will determine whether the League is at once and finally to disintegrate, or is to take on a new and desperately needed lease of life. Never was there, nor ever could there be, an occasion more perfectly fitted to the League's machinery. Italy and Greece are both members of the League; their quarrel is just the kind of peril which the League was ostensibly created to meet, and which the League advocates have repeatedly told us that it *will* meet. Now comes the test, which will be determined before this editorial note is printed. It is our hope that the League may accomplish something; certainly it could not be more favorably situated for effective work with the Assembly just on the eve of meeting! Under such circumstances, no explanations or apologies for failure can be accepted. Yet, at the moment of writing, the prospect is anything but cheering. The League has acted with its customary timidity, putting action off instead of acting as the Covenant empowers it to do. Italy has violated every obligation assumed as a member of the League, and, with a truculency characteristic of a brigand like Mussolini, announces that no intervention of the League will be recognized as this quarrel is a matter of honor between Italy and Greece alone. Meanwhile, Mussolini bombards and seizes Corfu and declares that this is not an act of war—which is as though General Beauregarde had declared in 1861 that he was not engaged in an act of war when he fired upon Fort Sumter! Whatever the language used, war has begun in Europe between two members of the League of Nations, under conditions exactly provided for in the Covenant of the League; and the League, providentially mobilized, has thus far done nothing. Defied by a swashbuckling dictator, it takes it lying down. We hope that the presence of men like Nansen and Cecil in Geneva may still avail something—and we wait to see!

In considering the present situation of Germany, it is just as well to remember that the German people are confronted by other enemies than France. Quite as serious are her own "industrials," as they are called—the big business men who control the great commercial and financial interests of the Republic, who are likely at any time to clasp hands with Poincaré, and sell their country for a price. Germany's problem, in other words, is quite as much enemies or traitors within as enemies without. These industrials, of whom Herr Stinnes is the conspicuous and most influential leader—and how perfectly his grim, blackbearded, piratical countenance "looks the part"!—have from the beginning been busy in capitalizing the misery of Germany. Immediately upon the signing of the Versailles Treaty, they took advantage of the opportunity always enjoyed by those having economic control, and began to make great profits out of the importation of foods and raw materials, out of the manufactured goods exported in exchange for these materials, even out of the falling mark, and all these profits moved abroad safe beyond the reach of German taxation on the one hand and Allied reparation on the other. Now that this unhappy venture has come to its appointed end, the next move is plainly that of coming to terms with the French iron and coal interests, which control the Poincaré government, and reaching agreements which will make null and void upon the instant all the heroic resistance of the German people since the French troops entered the Ruhr. We tremble each day as we take up our newspapers, especially since Cuno fell, lest we read that the traitorous bargain has been struck and the Germans sold for a mess of pottage. It's dirty business—and yet, under the present social regime, the most natural thing in the world. For the capitalist *as a capitalist* is the one man today who cares nothing for his country. War or peace, defeat or victory, shame or glory—it's all the same to him, if only his profits are assured.

Meanwhile, things go from bad to worse, with Germany approaching every hour nearer to extinction; and England and France keep on talking futilely to the horizon. It must be said in fairness that England is doing apparently all that can be done by a single power in the face of France's blunt and brutal blindness. Her efforts to save the situation put to shame the complicity and indifference of other nations, including most particularly our own United States. But nothing is accomplished—Germany perishes, and European civilization moves onward to its doom! Shall we be guilty of pressing a point altogether too hard if we ask once again, Where is the League of Nations, and why is it not acting in the extremity of this crisis? We cannot refrain at least from asking what is the answer to the articles recently published in the New York *World* and the *New Republic,* by John Maynard Keynes, on this very question of the League. Mr. Keynes points out that the League Covenant provides explicitly, article by article, for just such contingency as now exists in the Ruhr. *First,* it is to be noted that England and France are in dispute as to whether or not the occupation of the Ruhr is legal under the Versailles Treaty. Article XIII of the Covenant of the League, which France of course has accepted, binds France in such case to submit the dispute to arbitration. This she refuses to do. *Secondly,* France having repudiated her obligation, Article XIV of the Covenant of the League empowers either the Council or the Assembly of the League to refer the question to the Permanent Court of International Justice for advisory opinion. *Thirdly,* if the Court should sustain the opinion of the law officers of the British crown that the occupation of the Ruhr is illegal, then this occupation becomes an act of war, and Article XVII of the Covenant, and all articles delaying recourse to war, come immediately into effect. Here is the League, in other words, organized to meet just such an emergency as this—and it does not move! Yet this is the body which we are told is our one hope for the pacification of the world!

We have felt, ever since the first of August last, that we ought to say something in these columns about the anthracite coal strike now (September 3rd) in full operation. We have all along, however, been hopelessly mystified as to what to say! It would be easy enough, of course, to set down the familiar platitudes which crowd the editorial pages of the daily press. But why repeat them? Why say anything, if original comment is not possible? Such comment, we must confess, is certainly beyond us, for, so far as we can make out, the coal situation has developed exactly as it has always developed under similar circumstances in the past, and must always develop in the future so long as similar circumstances—i. e., our present social system—is allowed to prevail. All parties to the controversy have run true to form. The operators, firmly entrenched in their legalized right of private ownership of natural resources, have refused to concede anything which would diminish their profits, or weaken their monopoly control of a necessity of life. The miners, fighting one more battle in their unending struggle for existence, have refused to concede anything which will cost them ground in the waging of that struggle. The politicians, primarily interested not in public welfare but in partisan advantage, have been using the occasion as a happy opportunity for creating party capital. The government, committed to the *status quo,* and deferring therefore to the mine owners as representing a superior power to be obeyed and not controlled, is of course paralyzed. All this could have been prophesied from the beginning—so what is there to say? Nothing—except just this one thing! That if we had a real democracy in this country, the mines would be instantly seized by the people and operated for the people's advantage! This the government, either state or national, should do at once—should have done long since—leaving questions of compensation, etc., for later consideration and settlement. Public ownership of natural resources is the solution of the problem.

We picked up our newspaper on a certain morning not many aeons ago, and we read a letter addressed by Calvin Coolidge to the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, in which the President said—

> Our institutions, our social organization, our economic conditions are all of a quality and quantity which are worthy of our highest admiration.

We don't know exactly that we understand what our Chief Executive means when he speaks of the *"quantity"* of "our institutions, our social organization, our economic conditions" as "worthy of our highest admiration." But we gather in general that Mr. Coolidge thinks that everything is lovely—that this is just about the best possible of all countries in the best possible of all worlds. We turned the page of our newspaper, and we read a statement of the Committee on Law Enforcement of the American Bar Association that, in the matter of crime, the situation in the United States is "worse than in any other civilized country." While in 1921, says the Committee's report, there were 260 murders in New York and 137 in Chicago, there were last year in London only 17, no one of which remained "a mystery." Again, in France in 1919 there were 588 murders, whereas there were last year in 48 cities of the United States no less than 1,562 murders. President Coolidge is manifestly right when he speaks of this matter of *"quantity"!* In crimes of violence at least—both general crimes, as an ordinary murder, and special, as a Southern lynching!—America beats the world. Whether this aspect of "our institutions," however, is "worthy of our highest admiration," may well be doubted. On the whole we are inclined to think that there are some improvements

which can be wrought in this country, and that criticism is therefore quite as valuable an attitude of mind as complacency.

On August 21st last, General William Crozier, speaking at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, declared that France and not Germany was responsible for the competition in armaments that turned Europe into an armed camp in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This competition, said the General, had its origin and sustaining motive power in France's desire for revenge after 1870. It was only because France was outdistanced in the race, he continued, and was forced at last to confess defeat, that she voted for all the disarmament proposals at the first Hague Conference, and thus gained undeserved reputation as a pacific nation. This opinion, coming from one of the ablest and most scholarly of our American military men, is almost sensationally important. Whether it is true or not, we do not know, and would not pretend to know. But as a piece of testimony on a vital question, we believe it should be known and thoroughly discussed. What are we to think, therefore, when we find the New York *Times,* which has published the longest and most careful reports of the Williamstown Institute that we have seen in any newspaper, making no mention of General Crozier's speech? We saw our report in Ralph Courtney's special despatch in the New York *World,* which featured the speech as the chief event in the day's proceedings. And the *World* head-line writer covered the story accurately with the sentence, "France Is Blamed for Armed World by Gen. Crozier"! A careful search of the *Times,* however, on the same day, found no mention of Crozier at all. This means that the *Times* either missed the story or suppressed it. As we have never questioned the efficiency of the *Times* newsgathering service, we think we know which is the true explanation. Could anything be more outrageous, or more silly!

A centennial anniversary which passed almost unnoticed in August, was that of Charlotte Yonge. We wonder how many of our readers know this woman and her writings, and how far therefore it may be possible to regard this anniversary as anything other than one more proof of how soon we are forgot. Our only association with the name is that of seeing it in a certain volume of Roman history in our father's library; this was written, if we remember rightly, for children, or young people, but we thought it intolerably dull. Yet Miss Yonge in her mid-Victorian time was one of the most popular and influential of authors. "The Heir of Radclyffe" was undoubtedly one of the most widely-read books of the nineteenth century. Other volumes which came from her pen in the period between 1851 and her death in 1901—"Heart's Ease," "The Daisy Chain," "The Clever Woman of the Family"—were almost as popular as the masterpiece. Reasons for Miss Yonge's contemporary fame are not far to seek. She had real power as a story-teller, wove a thrilling plot, had a certain facility in character delineation, and a sense of humor. Then, too, she had in abundance the sentiment, the moralism, the piety, which were so peculiarly characteristic of Victorian England. It is these features of her work, ironically enough, which account most definitely for the quick decline of her reputation and influence. The very sentiment which won hosts of readers of yesterday, seems today transformed into sentimentality, and thus turns readers almost unanimously away. Only supreme genius, like that of Dickens or Charlotte Brontë, could overcome these features of a dead psychology, and of this Miss Yonge had scarcely a trace. In her life, Charlotte Yonge was devout and charitable. Religion was her enthusiasm—missionary work her avocation.

Kate Douglas Wiggin, dead last month in England, had an amazing fertility, and a gift of sustained popularity beyond that of almost any other author of her time. We remember, 'way back in our early boyhood, reading "The Birds' Christmas Carol" and "The Story of Patsy," then being read by everybody. Later came the "Penelope" books, each one apparently a greater success than its predecessor. The enormous vogue of "Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm" is a fairly recent event in the literary world. The secret of this popularity, running through more than a generation, and still happily sustained, is evident enough. It consists in a certain understanding of the human heart, a gracious delight in childhood and in the wholesome simplicities of child life, above all, a command of laughter and of tears that was remarkable. That little classic, "The Birds' Christmas Carol," with the pathos of the Birds family upon the one hand and the rollicking hilarity of the Ruggles family upon the other, tells the whole story of Mrs. Wiggin's unbreakable power over her great audience. Whether this was literary art and the result literature, we hardly dare to say. Certainly it would not be recognized as such by our newer school of sophisticated critics. Kate Douglas Wiggin would be a poor competitor with D. H. Lawrence, Sherwood Anderson, Waldo Frank, and Ben Hecht for the prizes of the hour. But if this "new stuff" be literature, then we count it everlastingly to the credit of Mrs. Wiggin that she fails to qualify. Personally we doubt that, in a final estimate of literary values, the author of "Rebecca" will be given any distinguished or permanent rank. But she gave healthful pleasure to millions of readers, revealed much beauty to simple hearts, and wrote a few books which will be read after many books with far higher claims as literature, have been forgotten.

Jottings

Professor Irving Fisher, in his new book, "The League or War," says all that can be said for the League of Nations. His prophecies of what the League is going to do for the world, however, leave us cold. We recall that Professor Fisher was the man who prophesied, on the eve of Harding's election by the greatest majority in the history of the Republic, that Cox was going to sweep the country on the League issue.

And now France, in addition to threatening to punish white men for insulting Negroes in public, has shut out "The Birth of a Nation" film from her movie theatres. Hurrah again for France! If only she would extend some of this real civilization to the Ruhr!

The American Legion is engaged in a most worthy undertaking when it raises the question of the limitation by international agreement of aircraft building for war purposes. But why stop with putting limitations upon war—limitations which always disappear when war comes? Why not abolish war altogether? Not to limit certain war weapons is cruel but to outlaw all war weapons as criminal, is the way out of the impasse.

Mr. Walter Lippman, writing in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August (page 245), speaks of such men as "Lord Curzon, Mr. Hughes, M. Poincaré, and Baron Kato, and so forth"! Senator Borah, replying in the September *Atlantic* (page 431), refers to "these gentlemen," and to his unwillingness to have them perform a certain international task. This seems to classify our Secretary of State pretty definitely—and, in our humble opinion, justly.

The fatal riot against the Ku Klux Klan in Carnegie, Pa., following the similar riot in Steubenville, Ohio, was a most regrettable affair. But the Klan is the last organization in the world to object. What the mobs are doing is simply to apply the old rule of tit for tat.

Ex-Governor Sproul, of Pennsylvania, declares that prohibition hastened Harding's death. "He was accustomed to an occasional Scotch," says the Governor. "In that laborious trip to Alaska I am sure he missed it." We have always known that the "wets" were hard up for arguments, but this is the worst we ever saw.

Clare Sheridan, writing from Koenigsburg, tells the world—or at least her readers—that the Living Church in Russia, is dead. It's amazing what distance can do to the observer! What nobody in Moscow has discovered, is clearly seen hundreds of miles away in the capital of East Prussia.

A Committee of the American Bar Association reports "that there are 1,500,000 radicals in the country." We cannot believe this. It is too good to be true.

J. H. H.

The Youth Movement

Editorial Correspondence.

I heard about the Youth Movement before I came to Germany. When I was in Australia, a year ago, I spoke on the subject. Since coming to Germany, November last, I have been looking for the Movement, have heard sounds of it, have visited its book store, have seen *Wandervogels* occasionally in the parks, etc., but not until today have I had a life-size, full view. This is Sunday night (March 11th), and I will tell about it before the impression flee.

It came about this way. I went down in the Weimar-Eisenach district last week, and spent a couple of days outdoors, especially in a walk from Eisenach up to Wartburg Castle (made famous by Luther's friendly imprisonment) and to Annatal—a splendid five-hour walk. It gave me an appetite for God's world. So, on my return to Berlin, I made it known that I wished to visit one of the "Herbergen" (rest huts) and get a look at the *Wandervogels*. No sooner requested than done. Then came today's trip, with the following experience:

At 6 o'clock a buzzer put me on my feet. At 7 o'clock I was on the pavement awaiting the coming of Dr. and Mrs. Erick Schelenz, who were my companions all day, until we parted after dinner at the Rheingold, on Potsdamerstrasse. Dr. Schelenz is several things, among them being director of athletics in Berlin's high schools, and now for three months engaged in a survey of the twenty "Herbergen" located within a radius of sixty miles of Berlin. Be it said, that a "Herberge" is a temporary abode at a cost of about eighty marks a day, and designed for the use of the *Wandervogels*. There are 1600 of them scattered over Germany, and are chiefly controlled by the Central Committee of the Youth Movement.

Eight o'clock found us, third class, on the train pulling out of the Stettiner Bahnhof. Our ticket read Bernau, and we were forty-five minutes on the train. Eight or ten young people, with guitars, were in our compartment. Nothing special happened. They were a quiet, jolly lot and, to the accompaniment of guitars, sang several songs, among them being "A Walking Song," "Thoughts Are Free," and "An Old Sol-

dier's Soliloquy." These were part of a group of twenty, the others being in another part of the train. They were about twenty-one years of age, dressed similarly with individual variations, the boys wearing brown corduroy knickerbockers with a blouse, the girls also wearing brown corduroy dresses, in one piece, or with a blouse. Their attire was all that could be desired, being simple, durable and cheerful.

On getting down at Bernau, a walk of two hours, mostly through a wood of planted pines, brought us to Uetzdorf, where is located the "Herberge" that we sought. Suffice it to say that it was a cold, wet March day, and not many hit this "Herberge," for rest and recreation; all of which gave me fine opportunity to study this group of twenty *Wandervogel*. They acted as naturally, as though a sixty-year-older was not looking on, and weighing them, their movements, and the destiny of mankind in the balance!

To write about the Youth Movement is not easy for one who was born when the good people of his village believed that God made the world in six days, of twenty-four hours each; that the whale swallowed Jonah, and who as a boy looked upon dancing as a mark of ungodly life. It's a long distance from my Ohio Sunday School days to this "Herberge"—likewise what I saw in the "Herberge" is a long way from the Quaker meeting that I attended last night. I desire to be fair to this Youth Movement, and honestly spread before you the things I saw and heard and learned, and I also desire to hold fast to things that are true; but particularly I desire to speak of the best things that may be.

To begin with, there were ten boys and ten girls in this group. I understand that all groups with boys and girls are equally divided; that they pair, shortly after forming, that marriages quite naturally spring from the wanderings; in fact, there were three married couples in this group, as a social resultant of grouping. There are other groups, entirely of boys or of girls, but when both sexes appear in a group they appear in pairs.

On arriving, shortly before noon, eating was the order of the day. Several had little spirit lamps and proceeded to prepare a simple, but hot meal. Brown bread sandwiches were chiefly in evidence, with some hot drink prepared on the big house-stove, several boys gathering sticks for the fire. This particular "Herberge" was used for years as the residence of a police guard. It is the property of the state, but is turned over for the "Herberge" purposes, at a nominal rental. Over the front door is the inscription, "Jugend herberge der Stadt Berlin." It is a ramshackel building, much out of repair, with large horse and cow barn attachment. All the buildings are utilized, as high as 100 people being accommodated on one day. *Wandervogels* may pause for a few hours or a few days. They are furnished with a straw tick, and the soft side of a wood floor. The house and the barn are unlighted, travelers being compelled to bring their own lights, in the shape of candles.

Shortly after the simple meal, the guitars, led now by a violin, struck up several songs, which were well sung and from memory. All were folk-songs. The singing gave way to dancing, which like the singing and meals was of the simple folk-order. Adjournment was made to the barn, where on a rough floor, twenty feet square, the dancing was continued. After witnessing several of the folk-dances, Dr. and Mrs. Schelenz and I trudged back to Bernau—in the walk and on the train and at dinner discussing "Herbergen" and the Youth Movement. I will tell you what is in my mind tonight. Something different about the Youth Movement may be in my mind a week from tonight.

The Youth Movement—and there are tens of thousands of the Youth of Germany in it—is a rebellion against the rule of the fathers, a break from the "dead hand," and a break from city life to the freedom of the country. The Youth propose to take their destinies in their own hands. There are different kinds of groups—socialists, nationalists, church, communist, while the particular group I saw today is a non-partisan business group. All the people on the wander are without "older" leaders. Whatever leader there may be is appointed by the group itself. At the last Annual National Meeting, the proposition to have "older" leaders was voted down. This is one thing to remember.

The Youth in this movement are teetotalers, as regards all alcoholic drink and tobacco. They do not tolerate profanity. They stand for good literature and art. Anyone found misbehaving is dealt with by the members of the group. This should be remembered. Here are some of the words forming the top bordering of the walls of the tiny dining-room:

> O Youth of the North. Seek the kernel of life from beginning to end. Man must not hate for life is short. When someone speaks to you an angry word, you must forgive. Without respect to persons, seek to win the soul of the people!

These words were put here by ten young people.

"What about the Movement?" I asked Mrs. Schelenz, who acted as an intelligent interpreter, when my American language was understandable. "What do the fathers and mothers say?" She replied that the majority of them were against it, for they feared certain moral results. And I can see how the parents would be scared at the idea of letting their youthful sons and daughters with guitars wander, singing into the forests and to the lakes. And as I sit here thinking of the twenty people, giving themselves up with zest to the dance until the gloaming and into the darkness, dispelled only by candle light, and the long walk through the woods to the train—it causes a shock to go down the backbone of my notions of "safety first" in morality. I have an antipathy to the dance—ancient or modern—that I cannot in fairness believe is entirely traditional prejudice. But I wish to be honest, and as I recall the dances I have seen on the steamers from Seattle to Melbourne—and Melbourne to London—and elsewhere—the dancing of the young people in the Wetzdorf "Herberge" seems like a breath of heaven as compared with a blast from the inferno; like sweet clover blossoms when compared with some of the sex stuff in many popular American magazines. I must confess that even my Puritan trained mind did not sense a single suggestion of sex impurity among these young people. From the time I saw them at 8 o'clock till I said "Good-bye" at 2 o'clock, I was happily disappointed. I watched them intently as they ate and cooked and sang and danced and paired and unpaired—and while there was much sex consciousness and expression, yet it all seemed to be free of evil suggestions. I would give much for pictures of several groupings of two, three or four that formed naturally under my eyes. I have seldom seen a finer exhibition of great natural joy as experienced by these young people. I am thinking at this moment that some of

age's criticism and condemnation of youth is due to jealousy.

So I am glad for the Youth Movement. I am glad that Youth proposes to break from the grip of the dead hand and take their destinies in their own hands. It would be difficult for Youth to do much worse by themselves than what has been done for them by their elders. I am glad that the Youth Movement stands against alcohol, tobacco, profanity and bad literature. If youth must dance, I am glad that it is attired in simple dress and insists on a return to simple, ancient dances, and to the folk-songs. When one shuts his eyes and thinks of these 1600 "Herbergen" scattered over Germany, with the tens of thousands of youths in motion, he realizes that a great emotional, health and social movement is under way that will tell on Germany's future. It is sure to spread to other lands, in fact it has already spread. I wish the movement might be out and out for world peace, but half of it in Germany is nationalist, and the movement may in some crisis be swept into militarism, as it was in 1914. While the sex dangers are considerable, as reasonable parents discern, yet sex life under this freedom, tempered and controlled by Youth itself, is likely to bring more purity than former social restraints. Few principles of life have more curative power than freedom. The cure for the abuse of liberty of press and speech is more freedom. The cure for impurity is more openness and freedom.

SYDNEY STRONG.

War Profit and Peace

The achievement of permanent peace throughout the world is undoubtedly impracticable at the present time, but the accomplishment of this task is not essential to the prosperity and progress of the more enlightened peoples of the globe. What is essential to this purpose, is the prevention of future wars between the great industrial nations and elaborate preparations for such wars, and this is believed to be entirely practicable provided that we work in harmony with the economic motives which have been the basic cause of all former wars between these nations. The latter part of this statement may be challenged, for there are many who believe that the importance of economic motives in relation to war has been greatly overestimated; that nations have frequently fought in behalf of some principle, and that desire for revenge and other emotions have been quite as potent in causing wars as has been the desire for gain.

This view is believed to be in error as applying to the great wars of modern times, and to have resulted from two mistakes in reasoning. The first, is the common custom of likening a nation to an individual and assuming that what is true of individuals must be true of nations. Because some men are so violent in temper that a trivial dispute may cause them to commit murder, while spiritual exaltation may induce others to give away all of their possessions, or even to sacrifice their lives to some ideal, the assumption is made that nations are capable of the same extremes; or at least, are liable on occasion to act with similar entire disregard of self interest. Possibly this may have been true in ancient times when public opinion in the modern sense did not exist, and many nations were controlled by absolute despots, but this is certainly not true of civilized nations today. In a modern enlightened nation, the quick tempered and unusually pugnacious are restrained by the prudent, and patriotism prevents any sacrifice of important national interests to an ideal; for such action would be most detrimental to the welfare of the state and state welfare is the sole concern of patriotism. The proof of this statement is the fact that no nation in modern times has endangered its welfare by waging a perilous aggressive war without hope of gain, merely to gratify hatred or a desire to fight; nor has any modern nation ever given away all of its surplus wealth, or sacrificed its important interests to an ideal. If the Spanish-American war be cited as seeming to contradict the above, the contradiction is not admitted, for the reason that the nations engaged in this war were so widely separated, and the aggressor nation was so much more powerful than its opponent, that neither the independence, nor the territorial integrity, nor any vital interest of the aggressor was endangered by the war. Moreover, this war was so exceptional in character that it would lead to error to base any conclusion on same, for this has been the only war of modern times in which the aggressor nation neither planned nor hoped to achieve any gain if victorious.

The second mistake, is in giving too little consideration to the insidious effect of profit motives upon the moral judgment of men. Experience has demonstrated that a great nation, or any large section of one, can always be relied upon to adopt any policy which is generally believed to be essential to its prosperity, whether this policy be morally right or morally wrong; but in the latter event, invariably, the men who support this policy will persuade themselves that the policy is morally right. When the welfare of our Southern States was believed to be dependent upon the continuation of slavery, the majority of the citizens of this section claimed, and sincerely believed, that this institution was of divine origin, and that most of the slaves were better off in bondage than they would have been if free. In consequence, during the civil war, most of the Confederate soldiers were convinced that they were fighting, not for economic advantage, but for a principle; the right to secede and become independent. In all great wars of the past, the fighting nations have never failed to convince themselves that their war aims were righteous whether this has been the truth or not; to pray to God for victory with entire sincerity, and to assume the right to kill by the wholesale, and to commit any other crime believed to be essential to their achievement of war success.

This faculty of self deception which has so often enabled men to persuade themselves that the wars in which they have engaged for profit have been fought in behalf of some principle, seems to make hopeless any effort to avert future wars by more intensive teaching of the doctrine of the brotherhood of men; for the universal conviction that self defense is morally right is hardly likely to be weakened by such teaching, and defense, either of rights or of possessions, is the usual camouflage adopted by national self interest in aggressive war. However, this view does not justify pessimism as to the future. If it is true that the policies of the powerful industrial nations are governed by their conception of what action is best for their national welfare, then it is certain that they will not

war with each other again unless convinced that great economic advantage will accrue to the victors. Therefore, our problem is not the hopeless one of changing human nature, for we do not need to substitute altruistic self denial for profit seeking in international relations. Instead, our task is to enlighten national self interest; to convince industrial nations that another war between them will result in certain great disaster to the victors as well as to the vanquished, and though exceedingly difficult, this task is entirely practicable. Aggressive wars waged by exporting nations to enforce control of primitive or backward peoples who are incapable of establishing a stable government, may continue to show a profit if not too expensive, for maintenance of order and commercial facilities within importing countries is essential to the prosperity of foreign trade; but wars between great industrial nations have become an anachronism and can be demonstrated to be no longer profitable to the victors.

Space will not permit of a detailed review of the exceedingly complicated relations of industrial nations, but attention may be directed to what appears to have been the principal mistake made by public opinion in pre-war days when considering these relations; a mistake which, unfortunately, many continue to make. Prior to 1914, it was almost universally believed that there was an essential difference between foreign and domestic trade; that the competition between great industrial nations was similar in character to that between independent merchants in the same line of business, and entirely different from the keen competition which never ceases between the different sections of every great industrial country. Because of the indisputable fact that an independent merchant would gain if he could seriously cripple his principal competitors by the expenditure of a moderate portion of his capital, it was assumed that the prosperity of a great industrial nation like Germany, for instance, would be greatly increased if she could seriously cripple her chief competitors by a short successful war; and that similar benefit would result to these competitors if victorious in a war with Germany. Public attention being thus concentrated upon the selling competition of industrial nations, each was popularly believed to be a hindrance to the commercial success of the others, and naturally, this conviction caused each European nation to be suspicious of its neighbors, and convinced of the necessity of being powerful. Hence, the race for armaments, and the system of alliances which made the eventual occurrence of a world war inevitable.

It seems very strange that this view should have received such general acceptance,* for it becomes at once apparent upon even a cursory examination of the facts, that the commercial relations between great industrial nations are of the same general character as those between the different sections of these, and entirely different from the relation which exists between independent merchants in the same line of business. A merchant has everything to gain from the crippling of his principal competitors for the reason that these do not buy extensively from him, and so are not valuable customers whose prosperity is essential to his own. He is economically independent of them, but great industrial nations are not economically independent of each other, for exactly the same reason that their sections are not economically independent; they are always heavy purchasers of each other's products. In pre-war days, Germany was the second or third best customer of England, France, and Italy, and these nations were among the best customers of Germany. Moreover, Germany was an excellent customer and so an important factor in the prosperity of many oversea customers of England, France, and Italy, and in the same way, these three countries contributed materially to the prosperity of Germany by their purchases from her oversea customers.

The crippling of the export trade of any one of these nations would necessarily cause the crippling of its purchasing power, and this purchasing power was, and is today, essential to the prosperity of the others. In brief, these great industrial nations are economically dependent upon each other, and this fact made certain that a war between them would be as economically unwise for all concerned as would be a war for commercial gain between England and Scotland, or between New York state and Pennsylvania; and the present condition of the participants in the late war is proof of this statement. All have lost heavily, the European victors almost as much as the vanquished, and it is now evident that England, France, and Italy cannot regain normal prosperity until normal prosperity returns to Germany and Austria.

Although admitting, perhaps, the importance of economic motives in modern wars, many may be inclined to believe that the intense national and sectional hatreds which now exist in Europe, are insuperable obstacles to permanent European peace, but hatreds of this character are not personal and self sustaining. They are impersonal, and are kept alive by a conviction of an antagonism of vital interests. Hence, they readily yield to a generally recognized community of interests, as witness the recent war alliance between England and France, and the strong pro-union sentiment which has developed in the South since the civil war. The latter instance seems to be conclusive proof of this view, for during the civil war, the North invaded the South and most of the fighting and destruction of property took place on Southern soil. In consequence, the hatred of the South for the North in 1865 was as intense as any hatred existing in Europe today. Moreover, the reconstruction policy of the North was not conciliatory, and on the contrary, tended to increase the hatred of the Southern states.

A few centuries ago, fighting between little states now included within the boundaries of France, of Germany, and of other modern European nations, was a constant occurrence, and this fighting was of the cruelest description. Permission to loot captured villages and towns was the customary reward of victorious soldiers, and the resulting hatreds were as intense as men are capable of feeling. To the men of those times, the achievement of permanent peace between these fiercely hating sections would probably have seemed impossible of accomplishment without a complete change in human nature. No such change has taken place, yet permanent peace does now exist between many of these sections, due solely to the gradual evolution of a conviction now universal, that war between these sections can no longer be made profitable to the victors.

*In his recent book, ex-Kaiser Wilhelm accuses England and France of conspiring with our country to crush Germany and Austria to "eliminate their competition from the world market." This accusation is unimportant, but it is interesting to note the ex-Kaiser's evident complete conviction that such elimination would be profitable to the eliminators.

There is no other adequate explanation of this phenomenon, for increase of altruism cannot have been the cause, otherwise international war would also have ceased. Nor can this change be attributed to the influence of a common racial origin, or a common language and similar religious beliefs, for the present peace between the French, German, and Italian sections of Switzerland, for instance, is no different in character from that existing between England and Scotland. Of course, the union of these sections under one government has greatly aided the maintenance of peace between them, but only because the resultant absence of tariff barriers, greater uniformity of laws, and the development of national interest, has made the inhabitants of these sections realize more clearly the advantages of co-operation, and the economic unwisdom of warring among themselves. Where the political union of one section with another has failed to achieve this enlightenment as in Ireland, or where united sections have developed an antagonism of important interests as happened in our own country, the existence even of a long established, popular, democratic form of common government, has not prevented the occurrence of civil wars.

It is not contended that a general recognition of the real community of their interests would immediately calm the seething hatreds of European nations, but it does seem beyond doubt, that such recognition would soon remove all danger of another war resulting from these hatreds, for great nations never wage terribly expensive wars merely to gratify hatred or a desire for revenge. Already, the intense hatred which existed between the English and the Germans during the war has moderated materially, due to the growing realization by the English of the importance to England's prosperity of German trade.

If we can convince international public opinion that under modern conditions, national prosperity cannot be advanced by an aggressive war however short and successful, when such a war is waged by one industrial nation against another, it appears almost certain that we can eliminate wars of this character; and this is believed beyond question if we can also make the masses understand just how such wars affect their interests. That is, if we can make members of the middle classes and wage earners realize clearly, that while they suffer most in wars of this kind, and help pay for the war losses, their share of the war gains, if there are any, is always negligible; for the reason that these war gains inevitably go to a comparatively small group of war speculators, war supply merchants, and fortunately placed or exceptionally efficient politicians and military leaders.

To achieve this enlightenment, we need an organized, systematic effort to this end, carefully kept free from partisanship. This last is most important, for experience has shown that an anti-war propaganda is foredoomed to failure, if the interpretation of war facts on which it is based, is juggled for the purpose of supporting the economic views of a partisan group. To be permanently effective, this enlightenment must reach the young, and this can best be accomplished through our public schools. Elementary instruction in the economic effects of war, if given in simple, perhaps dogmatic, form, would not take up a great deal of school time, no more than is now given to the study of general history; and certainly, accurate knowledge as to how war affects national and individual prosperity, is quite as valuable to a citizen as a superficial knowledge of history which, as now taught, tends to glorify war.

Some may fear that the teaching of an anti-war doctrine in our schools may cause our young men to become unwilling to assist in the defense of our country if attacked by an enemy; but this fear is believed to be wholly unfounded. Experience has demonstrated that men will readily fight for the achievement of national or personal gain, and surely, prevention of loss is quite as effective an incentive to fight as is the achievement of gain; and a successful invasion of our country would mean certain national and probable personal loss to our citizens. Moreover, patriotism is an emotion which is not in the least dependent for existence upon any economic conviction. Our Canadian neighbors are undoubtedly convinced that it would be economically absurd for their country to wage an aggressive war against the United States for the purpose of commercial gain; but no one will seriously contend that this conviction has lessened Canadian patriotism, or would weaken Canadian defense if the United States should run amuck and attempt to annex Canada by force.

Objection may be made that school instruction in the economic effects of war will be ineffective unless this school policy is adopted by the principal European nations, but this view is believed to be in error. If we can bring about such instruction in the schools of this country, European public opinion cannot fail to be very greatly impressed, and so likely to welcome the adoption of a similar school policy after the present war unrest and confusion have subsided; for Europeans generally are as eager to avert future wars as we are. However, if this does not happen, we shall nevertheless accomplish our purpose, provided that by this means we have developed an universal conviction in this country that war between industrial nations under present conditions is certain to be disastrous to the victors; for the ease with which economic convictions, both true and false, penetrate the barriers of racial antagonisms and language differences, has been demonstrated repeatedly. Trade unions and union methods are of the same general character in all industrial nations, including even Japan, and arguments in favor of or against capitalism, are the same in whatever country this subject is discussed. In fact, it seems safe to assert that it has become impossible for any economic theory to receive general acceptance in America, and be generally rejected by the more enlightened nations of Europe.

The present general realization by Americans, of the great economic gain that would accrue to European nations if they would clear out the channels of European commerce, and the unwillingness of these nations to do this, appears to contradict this view; but upon examination, it soon becomes clear that the basic cause of the existing artificial obstacles to inter-European trade, is the same economic conviction which supports a customs barrier between the United States and Canada, and which induces these sections to maintain different seaboard tariffs, and in other ways to act as though each were economically independent of the other. This conviction has caused more trouble in Europe than on this continent, simply because European nations speak different languages, and frequent wars have made them intensely jealous and distrustful of each other.

In 1914, Americans were greatly surprised by the outbreak of war in Europe, but this was due to our optimistic idealism, and not to any difference in our economic convictions, for our people were then almost as generally convinced of the possibility of achieving national gain by war as were the peoples of Europe. If at that time, a group of average American business men had been asked whether they believed that Germany, for instance, would benefit industrially if she succeeded by means of a successful war in permanently crippling the competition in world trade of England and France, most of them would have answered yes, provided that this war was short and not too expensive; and unfortunately, this view is still widely held.

Popular economic fallacies always die hard, and the dangerous war gain fallacy has survived many attacks. Moreover, this fallacy continues to receive the indirect and unintentional, but nevertheless most effective support of the public press. Newspapers thrive on sensations and so national imperialistic designs are always regarded as good copy by editors; but a careful analysis of the economic effects of such designs, if carried out successfully, is not considered to be of interest to the readers of newspapers. Editors may be aware of the fact, for instance, that the development of oil districts in Asia and Africa by England and France is certain to be of the greatest economic benefit to the entire industrial world, because of the resultant increase in the supply of oil for industrial purposes. They may also know that the exclusive gains which may accrue to these nations because of their political control of these oil fields, are merely in the nature of a commission on the oil produced, against which must be charged the cost of such control; and that even these gains may be shared by aliens, if they own or purchase shares in English or French oil companies, or if foreigners are allowed to participate in the development; but these facts are never mentioned in newspapers. Instead, these publications invariably convey to their readers the impression that the entire economic gain resulting from the development of territories which produce oil or other valuable products, is completely monopolized by the nations which exercise political control over these territories.

When the world realizes more clearly the lack of gain to the victors in the late war, and the dependence of their prosperity upon the prosperity of the vanquished, it is possible that industrial nations may become convinced of the futility of attempting to achieve commercial gain by warring with each other, even though no organized effort of any kind is made to accomplish this enlightenment. Beyond doubt this would result if the present generation remained in control, but soon a new generation will take their place. The horrors and waste of the late war will not be a vivid memory to the members of this new generation and if they have not received school instruction in war economics, they are likely to be as ignorant of the subject as have been generations of the past, and so as liable to be misled by a new generation of ambitious governing groups. BENJAMIN P. HORTON.

Non-Resistance in the Ruhr

[We print herewith a few paragraphs from a speech, delivered at the Institute of Politics, in Williamstown, Mass., by Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, an American, a business man, a Quaker, just returned from a visit of observation and investigation in Europe. These paragraphs, it will be noted, deal with the passive resistance policy practiced by the Germans in the Ruhr against the French invasion, and tell of its wonderful success. We feel it important that this authoritative testimony should be "broad-casted" as widely as possible at this time when reports indicate the betrayal of this policy by the new Chancellor, Stresemann, in collusion with German and French industrialists. Our newspapers are already falsely stating that passive resistance is being abandoned because it is a failure. As a matter of fact, it has been such a triumph that France has had to plead for mercy, and has unfortunately found German capitalists ready to play her game—for profit. Let it be remembered, from this time on, that non-resistance as a national policy against armed invasion, is no longer a fantastic theory. It is from henceforth a practical program which has been tried out with successful results!

We are indebted for these extracts from Mr. Scattergood's address to *The Christian Register*, which prints the address in full in its September 6th issue, page 845. The Editor reports that this address was "the greatest speech of the whole session . . . (its) reception was unparalleled, tremendous." —EDITORS.]

As to the conditions inside Germany let me speak about passive resistance in the Ruhr. I do not think [illegible] sive resistance is not lying down and stopping work. They are trying to make their plant run to the fullest [illegible] is operating about 80 per cent and trying to run as fast as possible. But what they will not do is to [illegible] thing in or out across the border and pay the 10 per [illegible] you come in here with your bayonets and try to make in New York taken by French troops. When the troops entered the station there was not a man in the place; it was absolutely empty—not a switchman, not a power-plant man. Whatever had to be done they had to do. They had to find their own men, pay their own men, house their own men, have them study the machinery, familiarize themselves with the tracks and signals and every detail of operation. They had a thousand problems to solve the first day, another thousand the next day, and they have not caught up with that infinitely complex situation.

Another example of the problem follows: When the French take a coal mine with their troops and machine-guns a whistle blows, and the men, maybe a thousand of them, come pouring up from underground. They stand with their arms folded and look at the French soldiers, and the French soldiers look at them. What can they do? They can't do anything. They can't shoot them; they haven't done anything to shoot them for. As long as the French soldiers stay there the Germans will go away and get a job somewhere else if they can get it, and if not, the Government has been paying them an 80 per cent unemployment wage.

The French have the mine; what will they do with it? They have to bring their labor there, pay them cold cash. I haven't a doubt that every ton of coal that France has been getting is costing $500 a ton and in the earlier days $1,000 a ton. As the head of the Miners' Union told me: "She is not getting 1 per cent of what we used to give her for nothing. In that chair where you are sitting I told the head of the

us work you won't get anything.' And they have not been getting 1 per cent."

Since that time I believe the figures I have seen have brought it up to 7 and possibly 10 per cent of the coal they were getting for nothing. Bayonets do not mine coal very well; helmets do not bring it up. Soldiers are out of place in industry; they don't belong there. One of the French generals said to us, "If they start anything we will massacre them." But if they don't start anything, what are they going to do? They are all dressed up and nowhere to go.

Do you realize that there is being tried today an experiment that is new in the world's history that has never been tried before on a big national scale, and it is working? I mean passive resistance. It is so baffling to the French that the one and only thing that M. Poincaré is crying out to the world today is, "Call off passive resistance, and then we will go back and talk of what we did in Genoa." It baffles them. Nobody knows how to meet it.

The question is being asked by millions of people. "If the great French Army is helpless, what is the use of having it? Why pay the bill for an army if it is out of date and can't work?" That is interesting working people over there very much. The working people of Germany see that vision. The rest of the world has not seen it.

They said to us over and over again, "Don't you Americans see this—the possibilities of non-violence?" They think they are like zealots in a new faith, carrying out something that is worth while as a grand experiment. Mr. Cuno said to us that the one and only hope that Germany had was to have no violence. "I did not go down there, as the French said, to oppose them; I went down there to tell the people what word had come really from the people themselves, that their only hope lay in non-violence; if there was any violence that trouble would immediately start; they must keep the men busy so they would not be in idleness and not be tempted to violence."

Parliamentary Control of Foreign Affairs

To lose one's most sacred possession—the right of protest—is sad indeed. This right had always been the inherent trait of the English people and, indeed, the trait on which our country was founded. But how quickly and entirely it disappeared during the last war! Even since the close of the war, one has looked almost vainly for any champion of this lost right. To be sure there was a small minority which never lost it—I refer to such papers as UNITY, *The Freeman,* and *The Nation* in this country, and *Foreign Affairs* and *The Daily Herald* in England. But, if one may judge by the result, their voices were scarcely heard—certainly not heeded. Of late the Labor Members of the House of Commons have voiced a vigorous protest, but where are our leaders—what party in Congress has raised its voice against the loss of our freedom and our rights? There are isolated cases to be sure—La-Follette, Borah—but where is the party that should rally to the support of these ideals? Every demand of the English people is, and has always been, not toward new desires, but toward "a return to the laws and customs of our land." If we continue to submit mildly to a withdrawal of our rights, what a spineless people we shall become. Let us consider what our condition would be now if we had not claimed the right of protest in '74, '75 and '76.

The first article in the August issue of *Foreign Affairs* is well worth our careful consideration. It is interesting to note that, while not considered a party question, 95 per cent of the signatories are of the Labor party. The article is quoted *verbatim.*

IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION TO MEMBERS OF DOMINION PARLIAMENTS

The following communication has been sent to all members of the Dominion Parliaments:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
London, S.W. 1.
July, 1923.

Dear Sir,

A number of Members of Parliament in Great Britain have for a long time been considerably exercised at the growing usurpation of the British Cabinet over foreign policy. We regard the existing constitutional safeguards and rules of procedure as altogether inadequate to secure that parliamentary control over foreign policy which is essential in the national interest. We do not look upon this subject as a Party question, and do not approach it from that point of view; but as a problem of supreme national and imperial importance.

We feel that it is likely that the events of last autumn must have created uneasiness in the minds of all thoughtful opinion in the Dominions, when the British Government issued an appeal to the Dominions to prepare for war with Turkey. The salient facts were these:

Last September the British Cabinet, or, more accurately stated (as has since transpired), a section of it, apparently determined to run the risk of war with Turkey. We are not here discussing the merits or demerits of the policy itself, but we point out that neither the British House of Commons nor the Dominion legislatures were given any opportunity of debating the subject, nor were they given any *data* to enable them to judge of the circumstances which had led to so grave a decision. The Dominion Governments were invited to send contingents to the Near East, without any preliminary warning that the situation was such as these messages indicated. If war had ensued, it would have been a war decided upon by certain British Ministers without any sort or kind of national or imperial consultation.

This is only the latest instance of the dangerous system under which we continue to live, in spite of the experiences of the Empire before and during the Great War.

Without proposing to raise in detail the antecedents of the Great War of 1914, we may point out that certain facts in regard thereto are no longer contestable nor, indeed, contested. The collection of pre-war official documents published during the past three years from the archives of the Russian, German, and Austrian Foreign Offices, the issue of certain Belgian and Serbian Foreign Office documents, together with the biographies and memoirs of many statesmen, diplomatic and military and naval authorities, who played a leading part in the Great War, and the researches of historians have definitely established that:

(a) Obligations and agreements, both of a political and military and naval character, were entered into by the British Cabinet with the Government of France and with the late Imperial Government of Russia without the knowledge of the British or of the Dominion Parliaments.

(b) These obligations and agreements, extending over long periods, powerfully influenced the action of British and Continental diplomacy.

(c) Parliament being kept in ignorance of these commitments, and indeed being assured that they did not exist, neither the British people nor the people of the Dominions were in a position to know the course of policy which was being pursued in their name, and were consequently unable to influence events.

During the war the same process was in operation.

The peoples and Parliaments of the Empire were committed without their knowledge to secret obligations towards our Allies which, based as they were upon considerations of territorial acquisition and economic conquest, made a negotiated peace impossible and a peace of reconstruction equally

impossible, and led eventually to a political settlement which has kept Europe in a turmoil for the past four years, to the grave detriment of national and imperial interests.

The signatories of this letter see in the situation here described a permanent menace to the security of the people of Great Britain and of the Dominions and a source of grave danger to peace and to the unity of the Empire; and we are anxious to know how far you may share our views, and to what extent co-operation might be established between Members of the House of Commons and of the Dominion Parliaments to deal with it.

Our policy here is to bring forward, when suitable opportunity offers, a resolution (herewith attached) designed to limit the power of the Executive and to increase the power which should properly appertain to Parliament in the matter of treaty making and war.

We ourselves are of opinion that the people of the Dominions are equally affected with the people of Britain. Even if a closer contact and working arrangement should become established, as the result of pressure from the Dominions, between the British Ministry and the Ministries of the Dominions in regard to the conduct of foreign policy, the problem of Parliamentary control in each Dominion would still remain unsolved.

We should be glad to have your views and suggestions on this matter of grave and urgent importance.

Yours faithfully,

J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leader of the Opposition; Labor, Aberavon), Rt. Hon. John R. Clynes (Labor, Platting), Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson (Labor, Newcastle E.), David Adams (Labor, Newcastle W.), W. M. Adamson (Labor, Cannock), A. V. Alexander, (Co-op., Hillsborough), C. G. Ammon (Labor, Camberwell, N.), C. R. Attlee (Labor, Limehouse), Joseph Batey (Labor, Spennymoor), F. A. Broad (Labor, Edmonton), William Bromfield (Labor, Leek), J. Brotherton (Labor, Gateshead), George Buchanan (Labor, Gorbals), Stanley Burgess (Labor, Rochdale), C. R. Buxton (Labor, Accrington), Noel Buxton (Labor, Norfolk N.), Thomas Cape (Labor, Workington), W. A. Chapple (Liberal, Dumfries), H. C. Charlton (Labor, Leeds S.), L. Collison (Liberal, Penrith & Cockermouth), Evan Davies (Labor, Ebbw Vale), Rhys J. Davies (Labor, Westhoughton), John E. Davison (Labor, Smethwick), T. Gavan Duffy (Labor, Whitehaven), Charles Duncan (Labor, Clay Cross), Charles Edwards (Labor, Bedwelty), Isaac Foot (Liberal, Bodmin), W. Graham (Labor, Edinburgh Central), Arthur Greenwood (Labor, Nelson and Colne), D. R. Grenfell (Labor, Gower), T. Griffiths (Labor, Pontypool), John Guest (Labor, Hemsworth), F. Hall (Labor, Normanton), G. H. Hall (Labor, Aberdare), George D. Hardie (Labor, Springburn), E. A. Harney, K.C. (Liberal, S. Shields), V. Hartshorn (Labor, Ogmore), Patrick Hastings, K.C. (Labor, Wallsend), J. P. Hay (Labor, Cathcart), John Herriotts (Labor, Sedgefield), Alfred Hill (Labor, Leicester W.), Dan Irving (Labor, Burnley), William Jenkins (Labor, Neath), William John (Labor, Rhondda W.), Thomas Johnston (Labor, Stirling and Clackmannan), Jack Jones (Labor, Silvertown), Morgan Jones (Labor, Caerphilly), R. T. Jones (Labor, Carnarvon), T. J. Mardy Jones (Labor, Pontypridd), F. W. Jowett (Labor, Bradford E.), W. A. Jowitt, K.C. (Liberal, The Hartlepools) Hon. J. M. Kenworthy (Liberal, Hull Central), D. Kirkwood (Labor, Dumbarton Burghs), George Lansbury (Labor, Bow & Bromley), J. Lawson (Labor, Chester-le-Street), William Leach (Labor, Bradford Central), Frank Lee (Labor, Derbyshire N.E.), F. C. Linfield (Liberal, Bedford Mid.), T. Lowth (Labor, Ardwick), William Lunn (Labor, Rothwell), V. L. McEntee (Labor, Walthamstow W.), Andrew Maclaren (Labor, Burslem), S. Marsh (Labor, Poplar S.), F. Martin (Liberal, Aberdeen E.), J. Maxton (Labor, Bridgeton), George Middleton (Labor, Carlisle), E. D. Morel (Labor, Dundee), Oswald Mosley (Ind., Harrow), John W. Muir (Labor, Maryhill), Robert Murray (Labor, Renfrew W.), Robert Nichol (Labor, Renfrew E.), James O'Grady (Labor, Leeds S.E.), G. H. Oliver (Labor, Ilkeston), W. Paling (Labor, Doncaster), John Allen Parkinson (Labor, Wigan), Arthur Ponsonby (Labor, Brightside), J. Pott (Labor, Barnsley), Robert Richardson (Labor, Houghton-le-Spring), Ben Riley (Labor, Dewsbury), J. Ritson (Labor, Durham E.), John Robertson (Labor, Bothwell), W. C. Robinson (Labor, Elland), W. S. Royce (Labor, Holland-with-Boston), S. Saklatvala (Labor, Battersea S.), Alfred Salter (Labor, Bermondsey W.), Tom Shaw (Labor, Preston), E. Shinwell (Labor, Linlithgow), J. Hope Simpson (Liberal, Taunton), Charles H. Sitch (Labor, Kingswinford), H. B. Lees-Smith (Labor, Keighley), Tom Smith (Labor, Pontefract), H. Snell (Labor, Woolwich E.), Philip Snowden (Labor, Colne Valley), George A. Spencer (Labor, Broxtowe), Ben Spoor (Labor, Bishop Auckland), J. Stewart (Labor, St. Rollox), J. Sullivan (Labor, Lanark N.), Charles Trevelyan (Labor, Newcastle Central), Ben Turner (Labor, Batley and Morley), Henry Twist (Labor, Leigh), R. C. Wallhead (Labor, Merthyr), Stephen Walsh (Labor, Ince), George H. Warne (Labor, Wansbeck), W. M. Watson (Labor, Dunfermline), D. Watts-Morgan, C.B.E., D.S.O. (Labor, Rhondda E.), Sidney Webb (Labor, Seaham), J. C. Wedgwood (Labor, Newcastle-under-Lyme), L. Macneill Weir (Labor, Clackmannan and Eastern), James C. Welsh (Labor, Coatbridge), J. Westwood (Labor, Peebles and Southern), John Wheatley (Labor, Shettleston), H. Graham White (Liberal, Birkenhead E.), William Whiteley (Labor, Blaydon), T. Williams (Labor, Don Valley), C. H. Wilson (Labor, Attercliffe), R. J. Wilson (Labor, Jarrow), M. Wintringham (Liberal, Louth), W. Wright (Labor, Rutherglen), Robert Young (Labor, Newton).

ANNEX

That, in the opinion of this House, no act of war against a foreign State shall be committed directly or indirectly without the consent of Parliament; no international treaty whatever shall be ratified until it has been submitted to and approved by Parliament; no diplomatic arrangement or verbal or written understanding with a foreign State, involving, even indirectly, military obligations, shall be finally concluded without the consent of Parliament, and no preparations for co-operation in war between the naval or military staffs and the naval or military staffs of a foreign State shall be lawful without Parliamentary sanction, and this resolution shall be communicated to all States with which we are in diplomatic relations and to the League of Nations.

In conclusion, I paraphrase Mr. Dooley: "What's the use of privileges when we have *rights?*"

H. S. N.

The Civilization of Asia

Some Europeans and some Americans look down upon Asia with a strange arrogance and semi-contempt, as if her peoples were inferior, as if her place in the world's civilization and the world's achievement was insignificant. But what are the facts?

Asia is the mother continent of the world. She is the mother of the world's most important races, including the races of Europe; she is the greatest mother of nations; she is the most important mother of languages; she is the mother of the alphabet and of letters; she is the mother of astronomy and navigation and mathematics and most of the arts and industries of the world; she is the mother of civilization, giving to the world its first great centers of enlightenment, many centuries before any part of Europe had emerged from barbarism; and when civilization began to penetrate Europe it was from Asia that it came. What is important, also, Asia is the mother of religions. All the world's great historic religious faiths are of Asiatic origin, not one arose on any other continent. Europe herself received both her Christianity and her Bible from Asia. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Paul, and Jesus were all Asiatics. Where then is there any ground for Europe's pride and arrogance when comparing herself with Asia?

New York. J. T. SUNDERLAND.

THE STUDY TABLE

THE ENCHANTED APRIL. By "Elizabeth." Doubleday Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y.

There is always a keen wit running through this author's work but often one gets the impression that she lubricates her typewriter with acid instead of oil. There is a bite and a sting in the stories that have the effect of a half-ripe persimmon upon the minds of the readers.

"The Man of Wrath" in "Elizabeth and Her German Garden" we cannot forget. We laughed at him but we hated him for his brutal rudeness.

So vividly does the author portray her characters that she cannot escape the sense of kinship to them.

But in "The Enchanted April" there is a bright, fanciful note that appeals to the wayward tendency that runs riot in all human things—rather drab women included—when the call of Spring is in the air.

The plain little heroine of this last book of "Elizabeth's" is whimsical to the last degree. She strains at her leash and an advertisement of a castle in Italy has a magic effect upon her imagination. She is an odd mixture of poetry and prose and she is, perhaps above all else, a tired little woman who has been fed up to her limit on the prosiac chaff of life. Her fancy leaps to that "castle," her practical mind bounds to her assistance. The mad idea must be financed—very good. Then, quite by inspiration, a woman is selected to share the adventure. With hardly any acquaintance with the woman, the heroine simply reaches forth, frees her from the herd, intoxicates her by the sheer wildness of the scheme and fires her sluggish imagination. At that pitch husbands and plain homes fall from sight. Duty is relegated to a rear position. Two or three other unsuspecting, and utterly commonplace, folks are corralled to supply the money. They are under the impression that they are *boarders!* Not at all: they are the crew that sails the magic bark to that garden and castle in Italy.

Can one read of the garden and flowers depicted without a heart beating faster? Does one not rest the soul as one follows the fortunes of the people in this exquisite fairy tale for tired grown-ups?

There is some good characterization of course; there is a wobbly bit of romance and a suggestion that the mad escapade fits the adventurers to live their later lives better, more appreciatively. This touch rather weakens the book. It is like an apology for the delicious madness. We do not want any sanity or explanation; we want our fairy story untouched by realism.

We who are tired and bored are grateful for the flight into Italy; we revel in the dream of bliss and it seems true until the proper husbands and the beseeching lover intrude. We are sorry to see them—just for a space we want just that *dream of women,* unhampered by sex problems and the demands of a home. We wanted to play about a little longer like disembodied spirits, before putting on rigid garments and going home.

The book makes us want to be truants and flyaways; it sets the suppressed yearnings free under blue skies and among bewitched flowers.

At the end we cry "why wake us up? We do not want to be good and feel grateful for our blessings. We want to feel, longer, the breezes of that enchanted April and do the things we might not do in *real* life!"

HARRIET T. COMSTOCK.

ATMAGNAN, OR LIFE IN THE SPIRIT. By T. L. Vaswani. Madras, Ganesh and Company, 1922; pp. 95.

The more I think of it, the more I feel that the message of the Atman is the need of Western Theology and Western Life. That there is need of reconstruction in Christian Theology, few will deny. . . . Would Europe have a Renaissance of the Christian consciousness? Then, I humbly submit, must Europe have the help of mystic India.

There in a few words is the thesis of Mr. Vaswani in his *"Atmagnan."* The brief space of the book does not permit him to make a thorough criticism of western theology, or to more than suggest the contribution of Hinduism. The approach is eclectic, and the author frankly admits that his ideal will not be found in common practice in India. Yet from the Indian scriptures he draws his conception of "Knowledge of the Self," and the Spiritual Synthesis which he sees as the great contributions of India to a needy world. He has the typical attitude of the philosophic Hindu that there is an essential unity of all religions and peoples, and he sees a need for such an idea in our international relations. He sketches rapidly the aspects of the great religions that seem to him lasting and worthful, and suggests a syncretic religion that will use the best of each and transcend all. If this work were a scholarly critique primarily, some of the statements and conclusions might be open to serious question. It is, however, a personal study, and as such will be found absorbing and helpful.

THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR A WARLESS WORLD. By Sidney L. Gulick. New York, Macmillan, 1922; pp. xiv, 197.

In preparing this little manual for the Federal Council of Churches Dr. Gulick evidently desired to appeal to as large a group of people as possible, and in order to avoid running into prejudice he decided to leave out of his book all consideration of pacifism and non-resistance as programs to end war. The aim of his work is constructive, and he seeks to unite all Christian men and women in the development of ideals and agencies that will make war unnecessary as a means of settling international disputes. The ideals he sets up and his practical suggestions for immediate efforts on the part of Americans are good, but there might have been more emphasis on the primary requisite of the will to not war. His approach is such as to make this book suitable for study classes and discussion groups. But there are several unfortunate aspects that weaken the work, from our point of view. It is lamentable that Germany is held up consistently as a horrible example. It does not help either Germany or the United States to say that we are just as bad in many respects as our late opponent. Since the "theoretical questions of 'pacifism'" were not to be discussed in the book it is decidedly unfair to condemn the pacifist program with a one-sided allusion and no hearing, as is done in Chapter seven. We acclaim any effort that will help to eliminate war, and we wish that much success may attend the use of this book. But, like many another good book, this book is not quite good enough.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

MANIFESTO OF LONDON PEACE SOCIETY

The following manifesto has been issued by the Peace Society, of London, England, under the signatures of its President, Lord Parmoor, and of its secretary, Rev. Hebert Dunnico, M.P.

The Peace Society, the oldest of all peace organizations, with branches and agents established in many nations, is deeply concerned at the critical situation which exists in Europe. There appears to be no hope for the nations now joined in a common suffering, save through a policy based on a true understanding of the claim of all countries to just treatment.

Our own country cannot avoid its share of responsibility, as one of the signatories to the Peace Treaties. It is a matter of national honor that we should shoulder the burden and encourage British statesmanship to take the lead by formulating a plan, which may hold out a promise of real peace and permanent settlement.

The Peace Society has no desire to criticize the recent statement of the Prime Minister to Parliament. It believes that this statement expresses, in general terms, the opinion held by the great majority of the British people, and that the Prime Minister can rely on a strong measure of national support on what is essentially a great national question. Each day, however, of further delay is fraught with danger to the whole fabric of European civilization. The Peace Society, therefore, urges the Government to formulate a clear and definite policy and to endeavor to mobilize all the world forces which are in favor of establishing a higher standard of human friendliness.

Above all, the time has come when it is essential to settle finally the amount of reparations which can be paid, within the capacity of any country from which payment is demanded. Germany is already pledged to the acceptance of the decision of an impartial tribunal or authority. Our country should be prepared to accept this pledge without hesitation, and at the same time be willing to give generous consideration in arranging a settlement of debts due to us from other Allied countries.

The Peace Society recognizes the special conditions which affect France and French opinion. It is, however, necessary to state quite clearly that the military occupation of the Ruhr district is open to be construed as a movement to obtain terms not only inconsistent with the Treaty of Versailles but considered and rejected when that Treaty was framed, with the assent of France. The continuance of this occupation postpones a settlement of the reparations question, and naturally creates a heritage of animosity which threatens the peace of all Europe. The creation of this spirit in a special way is calculated to imperil the future security to which France and the French people attach so much importance. We should appeal to France to give assistance in promoting peace and not strife and should not shrink from frank statement on critical issues when there is difference of opinion. Peace is the foremost need; no doubt it involves both service and sacrifice, but without peace there can be no emergence to a new and higher order of world life.

PROF. STARR SAFE IN JAPAN.

Professor Frederick Starr, for whose safety during the Tokio disaster grave doubts had been expressed, was placed among the uninjured survivors in dispatches from Kobe. This is a relay station for information which Ambassador Woods in Tokio is cabling to the state department.

—*Chicago Tribune*—September 12.

MR. SASTRI AND OPIUM.

"It is the duty of the United States to take the leadership in the world-wide movement to eradicate the illicit international traffic so that the use of drugs . . . shall be strictly confined to the alleviation of human suffering."

—*Hon. Stephen G. Porter.*

"This is to be a hard fight."

—*Mrs. Hamilton Wright.*

"We must recognize clearly that the British Government . . . is the source of supply . . . In official reports issued by the British . . . no attempt is made to hide the facts."—*Ellen La Motte in "The Opium Monopoly."*

"The latest action of the League of Nations is most discouraging. The American proposal of restricting the production of opium only for medicinal and scientific purposes, has not been accepted in a way that can be effective."

—*New York Times*—June 2, 1923.

EXTRACT FROM AN ARTICLE BY REV. C. F. ANDREWS, IN *Young India** —JULY 12, 1923.

". . . at the Opium Session of the League of Nations Assembly (Mr. Sastri) had been primed by the Government to speak on a subject *he knew nothing about!* It was he more than anyone else, who had obtained with regard to the use of opium that miserable word 'legitimate' to be substituted for the words 'medicinal and scientific' in the League of Nations' formula for opium restriction. . . ."

(Here follow sundry facts anent the *"legitimate"* use of the drug and the horrible results; the refusal of the British Government of India to close opium shops; and concluding with a description of the opium dens in Singapore, where the Government—to use Mr. Andrews' words—had allowed its merchants to be lightly taxed, while it had made nearly half its revenue out of the opium traffic; . . . (of) licensed opium dens where Government monopoly opium was sold and smoked"; and Mr. Sastri's reply, *"Mr. Andrews, 'This is horrible; I knew nothing of this. They told me that the Government of India export of opium was above reproach because the Government did not sell it to private persons, but only to governments who carried on legitimate consumption.'"*)

"'Legitimate!' said I, 'Yes—legitimate in Singapore! But if the poor Chinese sailor, who has gone openly into the shop in Singapore and has smoked his opium freely there under the protection of the British flag—if the same Chinaman goes into the shop in Liverpool, and tries to do the same thing *there*, he soon finds out whether it is *legitimate* or not! He is at once put into jail by the police, and gets eighteen months' hard labor from the magistrate. Don't you realize, Sastri,' I went on, 'that the Government has been playing the hypocrite—taking all the credit for stopping its traffic in China; yet all the while continuing to sell it to all the ports where Chinese congregate, just outside of China itself—ports which are chiefly in British occupation'; that . . . our own Indian ex-endentured laborers had been *doped* with opium, just at the very time that they were trying to rise out of the immoral conditions of the past. . . .'

"He (Sastri) said to me again, 'But, Andrews, they never told me these things at Simla. Why, I went to

*Mr. Andrews is an Englishman, a long time resident of India. *Young India* is a paper started by Mahatma Gandhi. It is allowed to exist as long as it adheres strictly to the truth.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF COUNTESS TOLSTOY, translated by S. S. Koteliansky and Leonard Woolf. New York, Huebsch, 1922; pp. 159.

This restrained but passionate cry for understanding from the wife who loved but could not understand Tolstoy is a momentous addition to our Tolstoy literature. In Russia the controversy over the relations of the Countess Sophie Tolstoy and her Leo Nikolaevich has developed a considerable body of published comment. To us the question is less vital, but scarcely less interesting. Here, for the first time, we see the Countess' side from her own viewpoint; her devotion, her jealousy, and her bitterness against Chertkov and all the other friends of Tolstoy who, she believed, alienated him from her, causing trouble when all would have been well otherwise. The document is tender, pathetic, poignant, bitter, and appealing, but it is ever only one side of the question. This translation is admirably made from the original edition of Vassili Spiridonov, and his preface and most of his notes are retained, while some additional notes are appended. All details of importance and obscure allusions of the short autobiography are thus amply expanded, explained, and illuminated. Mechanically the volume is worthy of its contents; which is high commendation.

B. F. M.

Geneva thinking that the conduct of the Government was irreproachable and I took up that position all the while at the Assembly meetings.'

"'Yes,' I said to him, 'and do you know what Sir J. Campbell (representative of the British-Indian government) has been saying in an interview to the world newspaper reporters at Geneva? . . .'

"He said to me hastily and eagerly, 'No, what?'

"I said to him, 'Mr. Campbell has said that no Indian leader, even among the opponents of Government—no, not *even Mahatmaji* (Gandhi) *himself*—has found anything to reproach the Government about, with regard to the opium traffic. And he has been lecturing the whole world on the spotless virtues of the Indian Government, which HE represents, (Capitals added) . . . and he will bring your name in as an ardent supporter of (his) opium policy.'

"I then explained to Mr. Sastri, that I should have to speak strongly about this in public; for it must not be allowed to go uncontradicted. The opportunity came at Caxton Hall, and what I said has been cabled abroad. Thus Mahatmaji's name was cleared. . . ."

Answers Mr. Bryan

The Spark in the Clod

(or RELIGION AND EVOLUTION)

By J. T. SUNDERLAND, D.D.

I. The Evolution of the World
II. The Evolution of Man
III. The Evolution of Religion
IV. The Problem of Pain and Evil in the Light of Evolution
V. Immortality in the Light of Evolution
VI. The Bible, Jesus and Christianity in the Light of Evolution

The author claims that Evolution is the greatest modern illuminator and emancipator of religious thought. Many judges pronounce this book the clearest and most effective answer yet made to Mr. Bryan and others that fear Evolution.

"A work of profound scholarship."—*Boston Journal.*

"A remarkably lucid statement of the bearing of Evolution upon religious thought."—*St. Paul Dispatch.*

$1.15 postpaid.

BEACON PRESS

25 Beacon Street Boston, Mass.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

Subscribe for and read

UNITY

$3.00 the Year

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 **120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO**

For Restful Nights

Drink a glass of pure, sweet BOWMAN'S MILK each night before you retire.

Its creamy richness tranquilizes troubled nerves and helps you drift swiftly into restful slumber.

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue